

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/710,453	07/13/2004	Kerry Bernstein	BUR920040024US1 4452	
30449	7590 12/20/2005		EXAMINER	
SCHMEISER, OLSEN + WATTS			TAN, VIBOL	
3 LEAR JET L	LANE			
SUITE 201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LATHAM, NY 12110			2819	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/710,453	BERNSTEIN ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Vibol Tan	2819				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	dress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMENTAL IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Densions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE!	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 D	ecember 2005					
<u> </u>		s action is non-final.					
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowa		secution as to the	merits is			
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under E	•					
Dispositi	·						
· <u> </u>	isposition of Claims						
• —	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.						
\	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>23-32</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
_	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  ☑ Claim(s) 1.4.6.7.9.13.14.15.17.18.20 and 21 is/are rejected.						
·	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,7,9-12,14,15,17,18,20 and 21</u> is/are rejected. ☑ Claim(s) 5.8.13.16.10 and 23 is/are chicated to						
	☑ Claim(s) <u>5,8,13,16,19 and 22</u> is/are objected to. ☑ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
ت (٥	Ciairi(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CF	R 1.121(d).			
11) 🔲	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National S	Stage			
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	-152)			

Art Unit: 2819

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidaka (US 2002/0008999).

In claim 1, Hidaka teaches all claimed features an integrated circuit in Fig. 3A, comprising: one or more logic stages (cascading inverters), at least one of said logic stages having a predominantly high input state (logic 1 to the input of second and fourth inverters) or having a predominantly low input state; wherein said logic stages having said predominantly high input state (logic 1 to the input of second and fourth inverters), comprise one or more than gate dielectric (Tox1=thin) PFETs and one or more thick gate dielectric (Tox2=thick) NFETs; and wherein said logic stages having said predominantly low input state (logic 0 to the input of first and third inverters), comprise one or more thick gate dielectric (Tox2) PFETs and one or more thin gate dielectric (Tox1) NFETs; with the exception of teaching the PFETs for the predominantly low input state having high threshold voltage with respect to a reference PFET and the NFETs for the predominantly low input state having low threshold voltage with respect to a reference NFET, and the PFETs for the predominantly high input state having low threshold voltage with respect to a reference NFET, and the PFETs for the predominantly high input state having low threshold voltage with respect to a reference PFET and the NFETs for the

Art Unit: 2819

predominantly high input state having high threshold voltage with respect to a reference NFET. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs in the logic stages of Hidaka's circuit, to further reduce power consumption in the standby state by suppressing leakage current in the logic stages.

In claim 2, Hidaka further teaches circuit of claim 1, wherein: said logic stages (the second and fourth inverters) having said predominantly high input state (logic 1) comprise all thin gate dielectric (Tox1) PFETs and comprise all thick gate dielectric (Tox2) NFETs; and said logic stages (the first and third inverters) having said predominantly low input state (logic 0) comprise all thick gate dielectric (Tox2) PFETs and comprise all thin gate dielectric (Tox1); with the exception of teaching wherein PFETs for the predominantly low input state having high threshold voltage and the NFETs for the predominantly high input state having low threshold voltage, and the PFETs for the predominantly high input state having low threshold voltage and the NFETs for the predominantly high input state having high threshold voltage. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs, since it has been held that where the general

Art Unit: 2819

conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs in the logic stages of Hidaka's circuit, to further reduce power consumption in the standby state by suppressing leakage current in the logic stages.

In claims 3-4, Hidaka further teaches the circuit of claim 1, wherein: all of said logic stages have either a predominantly high input state (second and fourth inverter, each is high) or a predominantly low input state; and wherein logic stages having predominantly high input states are connected in series with logic stages having predominantly low input states, said logic stages having predominantly high input states alternating with logic stages having predominantly low input states (as seen in Fig. 3A).

In claim 6, Hidaka further teaches the circuit of claim 1, wherein said logic stages (first to fourth inverter stages) operate monotonically (sequences whose successive members either consistently increase or decrease but do not oscillate in relative value).

In claim 7, Hidaka further teaches the circuit of claim 1, wherein said logic stages comprise pulsed CMOS logic circuits (Fig. 3A is CMOS logic circuits), dynamic domino circuits or fuse evaluation circuits (only one of the limitations has to be met, since the "or" conjunction is recited n the claim).

In claim 9, Hidaka teaches in Fig. 3A, a method of reducing leakage current in a circuit comprising specifying a reference PFET (selecting a PFET) having a specified threshold voltage (threshold voltage for the selected PFET) and gate dielectric thickness

Art Unit: 2819

(thickness of a gate for the selected PFET) and a reference NFET (selecting a NFET) having a specified threshold voltage (threshold voltage for the selected NFET) and gate dielectric thickness (thickness of a gate for the selected NFET); providing said circuit, said circuit having one or more logic stages (as seen in Fig. 3A); connecting at least one of said logic stages to an input having a predominantly high input state (logic 1) or having a predominantly low input state (logic 0); wherein said logic stages (second and fourth inverters) connected to said input having said predominantly high input state (logic 1), comprise one or more thin gate dielectric (Tox1 is thin) PFETs and one or more thick gate dielectric (Tox2 is thick) NFETs; and wherein said logic stages (first and third inverters) connected to said input having said predominantly low input state (logic 0), comprise one or more thick gate dielectric (Tox2) PFETs and one or more thin gate dielectric (Tox1) NFETs; with the exception of teaching wherein PFETs for the predominantly low input state having high threshold voltage and the NFETs for the predominantly low input state having low threshold voltage, and the PFETs for the predominantly high input state having low threshold voltage and the NFETs for the predominantly high input state having high threshold voltage. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs

Art Unit: 2819

in the logic stages of Hidaka's circuit, to further reduce power consumption in the standby state by suppressing leakage current in the logic stages.

In claim 10, Hidaka further teaches the method of claim 9, said logic stages (the second and fourth inverters) having said predominantly high input state (logic 1) comprise all thin gate dielectric (Tox1) PFETs and comprise all thick gate dielectric (Tox2) NFETs; and said logic stages (the first and third inverters) having said predominantly low input state (logic 0) comprise all thick gate dielectric (Tox2) PFETs and comprise all thin gate dielectric (Tox1); with the exception of teaching wherein PFETs for the predominantly low input state having high threshold voltage and the NFETs for the predominantly low input state having low threshold voltage, and the PFETs for the predominantly high input state having low threshold voltage and the NFETs for the predominantly high input state having high threshold voltage. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the threshold voltages of the PFETs and the NFETs in the logic stages of Hidaka's circuit, to further reduce power consumption in the standby state by suppressing leakage current in the logic stages.

In claims 11 and 12, Hidaka further teaches, the method of claim 9 further including connecting all of said logic stages to either a predominantly high input state (second and

Art Unit: 2819

fourth inverter, each is high) or a predominantly low input state; and further including logic stages having predominantly high input states are connected in series with logic stages having predominantly low input states, said logic stages having predominantly high input states alternating with logic stages having predominantly low input states (as seen in Fig. 3A).

In claim 14, Hidaka further teaches the method of claim 9, further including operating said logic stages (first to fourth inverter stages) monotonically (sequences whose successive members either consistently increase or decrease but do not oscillate in relative value).

In claim 15, Hidaka further teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said logic stages comprise pulsed CMOS logic circuits (Fig. 3A is CMOS logic circuits), dynamic domino circuits or fuse evaluation circuits (only one of the limitations has to be met, since the "or" conjunction is recited n the claim).

Method claims 17, 18, 20 and 21 correspond to detailed logic circuitry already discussed in method claims 9, 10, 14 and 15.

- 3. Claims 5, 8, 13, 16, 19 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. Claims 23-32 are withdrawn from consideration.

Art Unit: 2819

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vibol Tan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00 AM-4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rexford Barnie can be reached on (571) 272-7492. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VIBOL TAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER